





## THE ANNUAL MEETING

The Annual Meeting was held on January 19, 1950 in St. Stephen's Church, New York, after Evensong which was said by the Vice-President and the Secretary at 5.00 o'clock. The Rev. Dr. Sutton, the Vice-President, presided, and spoke with regret of the absence of Dean Welles, our President, unable to be present; Dr. Sutton also paid him a tribute, saying how honored the Society is in his becoming Bishop of West Missouri. A motion conveying cordial greetings and hearty good wishes to him was unanimously voted.

The Minutes of the last Annual Meeting were read and approved. The Treasurer (Mr. Lackmann) reported a balance on hand in the current fund of \$118.04, and in the publication fund of \$27.60, but as bills against the Society are \$306.70, we have really as of December 31, 1949 a deficit of \$161.06. This we hope may shortly be cleared. Canon Hill as Treasurer for the distribution of the *English Catholic* reported \$17.00 from 16 subscribers: expenses were \$9.88, leaving a balance of \$7.12.

The Secretary informally reported for the Executive Committee meeting held that afternoon in the Parish House of St. Thomas Church, through the courtesy of the Rector, Dr. Brooks. Mention was made of the great success of the commemoration service for 1549 held in St. Paul's Cathedral, Buffalo, last June 9th. Also was noted our attractive booth at the late general convention, where many leaflets and much information were distributed; a Corporate Communion of the Society at St. Francis Church, with a breakfast after served by the generous parishioners was gratefully remembered. The possibility of a meeting between committees of the American Church Union and the Anglican Society was mentioned, the President appointed as our committee, the Rev. Dr. Dunphy and the Rev. Francis Blake.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Rev. Dr. Dunphy then addressed the meeting, saying that a very serious situation has been produced by the attempt of the 1949 General Convention to legalize, by its own authority and without ratification by the next General Convention, the practice of intinction in the administration of Holy Communion. Despite the Lambeth recommendations on this subject,\* which are purely advisory and have no legislative force, there is the serious question as to whether the authority of the Church extends so far as to legalize a practice of this nature, in contravention to the command of Christ. Our Lord, in giving the Apostles the Chalice of His blood, said, "Drink ye all of it."

Books suggested by the Examining Chaplains for use in preparing *Diocesan Lay Readers*—

*Guide For Lay Readers* (Morehouse-Gorham)

*Instructions in the Life of Prayer* by Whiston, (10 cents)

*Faith and Practice* by Wilson

*The Anglican Church and Henry VIII* by Hughson, (O.H.C.)

*Story of the Bible* by Bowie (\$2.95)

*Religion of the Prayer Book* by Pell and Dawley

*A Short History of the Christian Church* by C. P. S. Clark

*The Holy Scriptures* (National Council, \$1.50)

*The American Prayer Book* by Suter & Cleveland.



The Church of England and the entire Anglican communion have always objected most strenuously to the Roman practice of communion in one kind under normal conditions on the ground that it contradicted this command of Christ. Article twenty ("of the Authority of the Church") declares, "The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written."

This has generally been expounded by interpreters of the thirty-nine Articles, as directed particularly against the Roman practice of communion in one kind. If so it applies no less against the practice of intinction, as this is generally practiced among us, since intinction is not drinking. If the authority of Western Christendom as a whole at the Council of Trent was not sufficient to override or repeal our Lord's command, it is quite clear that the Authority of the General Convention of one Province of the Anglican Communion is insufficient to do so, even though the change had been made in the way the Constitution of this Church prescribes.

But this has not been the case. The attempted change has not been made constitutionally. The Constitution of the Church prescribes that amendments to the Prayer Book must go through two successive General Conventions to have force. The attempted legalization of intinction has passed through only one Convention. The attempt is being made to change the practice prescribed by the Prayer Book Rubric as to the Administration of Holy Communion without amending the Prayer Book itself. (B.C.P. 82-83). The Prayer Book Rubrics (p. 82-83) clearly envisage a separate administration of the consecrated Bread and the Cup, and the language used makes no sense if one supposed that the dipping of the consecrated wafer was envisaged, rather than the drinking from the Chalice. The words, "Drink this," obviously clinch the matter, since dipping is not drinking. If there were the slightest doubt as to the meaning of the words, which there is not, the Anglican practice of the last four hundred years is a sufficient guide to their interpretation.

This attempt to override the plain provisions of the Prayer Book without amending the Prayer Book itself constitutionally would, if allowed, set a most dangerous precedent. We have seen in the last generation in the civil and secular sphere how the attempt to take short cuts to reforms, even where those reforms are desirable, has played into the hands of despotism and totalitarianism. Church history affords many examples of the same kind. In 1854 the Pope proclaimed, on his own authority without a Council, the doctrine that Mary was conceived without original sin. This doctrine was believed by most Roman Catholics, and probably was not denied by any Roman Catholic Bishop of that date. The Bishops, therefore, acquiesced in the Pope's proclamation of the dogma, even though many of them did not

accept papal infallibility. In 1870, when the Vatican Council met and the question of the Pope's infallibility was brought up, some of these same Bishops protested against the new dogma, but it was pointed out to them that in accepting the proclamation of Mary's immaculate conception by the Pope, without a Council, they had already virtually accepted papal infallibility, and the ground was cut from under these protesting Bishops.

If a single General Convention, without repealing the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer by constitutional procedure, can change the Church's practice and virtually repeal our Lord's command, it is hard to see what limits there are to the power of any General Convention. The constitutional procedure by which our Church is bound provides for mature deliberation by two successive General Conventions, and gives a chance to focus the mind of the entire Church on the problems, disciplinary or doctrinal, in the three years interim between Conventions. It provides for a proper consideration of the rights of minorities as well as of majorities. It is a safeguard against being carried away by the fashion of the moment; against the Church being stampeded into rash or heretical action. It is a safeguard against despotism, not least the despotism of popular whim.

But if the change now envisaged is allowed to pass without protest, all these safeguards are done away. There is nothing in the faith and order of our Church, or of the Holy Catholic Church as a whole, which could not be swept away by a single General Convention if this precedent is to be allowed. The following Resolution is therefore respectfully submitted:

"THAT WHEREAS the Constitution of our Church provides that the provisions of the Prayer Book can be changed only by the action of two successive General Conventions, and

"WHEREAS the attempt to legalize intinction by the action of one Convention constitutes a virtual repeal of the Prayer Book directions as to the Administration of Holy Communion, and in the opinion of many constitutes a violation of our Lord's own command.

"AND WHEREAS such unconstitutional procedure constitutes a grave threat both to the liberty of the Church and to her faith and order, and creates a most dangerous precedent for the future —

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Anglican Society strongly protests this action of General Convention and declares its belief that it is unconstitutional and therefore null and void, and urges that its members and other groups of Churchmen, both clerical and lay, strongly protest against this attempt to override the Law and Constitution of the Church."

This Resolution was duly seconded and passed unanimously.

A motion of cordial greeting to Canon Daniels and of regret that for the first time in many years he could not be with us, with earnest wishes for his complete recovery from serious illness was unanimously passed.

The Secretary quoted from a letter of Bishop Jenkins, unable to be present, stating that the Society had done much good in stirring up churchmen to celebrate properly the great anniversary of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, issued in 1549.

The present officers were reelected:

<i>Honorary President</i>	Bishop Oldham
<i>President</i>	Dean Welles
<i>Secretary</i>	Canon Hill
<i>Treasurer</i>	Mr. William D. H. Lackmann

Dr. Sutton announced that the President had appointed himself as Literary Editor, and as Editor of the Anglican (provisionally), Canon Hill, with the Rev. Dr. Dunphy and the Rev. Frederick W. Kates as associates. Later, the President appointed to the Executive Committee the Reverends Canon, Daniels, Dr. Dunphy, F. E. Blake, A. W. Brown, and Frederick W. Kates.

At seven o'clock the members sat down to an excellent dinner in the parish house, cooked by the sexton, and served by St. Stephen's women. After the dinner, the Rev. Dr. James A. Pike, Chaplain of Columbia University, gave a very interesting and valuable address on the way in which Anglicanism preserves and enforces the great contributions, to the Christian Religion made by eminent Catholic and Protestant scholars.



## HIGH OR LOW?

by the Rev. Canon Louis E. Daniels

*(It is a great pleasure to print this, the last paper that Canon Daniels has written for us, in the Anglican. Many of our Society know of the Canon's serious illness and are praying for his recovery. — Ed.)*

"Mrs. Nockitt says that our church is too high for her; we aren't high, are we, Mr. Rector?" So spoke a good woman of my parish, echoing the words "high" and "low" which are tossed about nowadays with wearying frequency.

"Let me try to explain the matter and to clear up some common misunderstandings," said I. Here follows my little discourse which, it seems to me, may be helpful to others.

"High Church," according to the dictionaries, means "holding a high view of the Church as a major instrument in the work of salvation, and of the priesthood as the Church's chief agents in carrying on her work."

According to definition, we Episcopalians ought all of us to be considered "high church" because our Prayer Book sets forth exactly such an estimate of the Church and of her ministry; examine the book throughout and see if this is not true — her solemn declarations in the various ordination forms, her clear statements in the Preface to the Ordinal, her careful use of the word Priest in all the rubrics, distinguishing it from the lesser word Minister. We cannot honestly overlook the fact that this church of ours has a high estimate of her appointed work in the world and of her authorized agents in carrying it out. Indeed, we ought to like the word "high" as supplied to the Church since this word has no end of honorable uses in our language — high courage, high patriotism, high learning, high culture, high achievement, high character. We need not wonder at the reply of that old clergyman to a newly arrived Methodist minister who asked, "Are you high or low, Mr. Kay?" He thought for a moment and said, "I wouldn't care to be considered low in anything, would you?"

As a matter of fact, the word "high" as commonly applied to this or that congregation is meant to imply that an elaborate ceremonial is employed there, though really the word has nothing to do with ceremonial. What is ceremonial? Our Prayer Book provides certain things to be said and done in carrying out her services; there are places for doing each of them — altar, font, lectern, pulpit — and going to and from these places and performing the acts directed constitute ceremonial. There have been people who argued that leaving these things uncared for and performing them in an extempore and sloppy way is better than arranging them with thought and care, but I

fancy there are few such people today. There has been through the years an increasing taste for decency and order.

Let us consider now in order a few details of a thoughtfully arranged ceremonial: *a.* Processions; *b.* Vestments; *c.* Postures and Gestures; *d.* Accessories.

(*a*) Processions. Americans love them; think of the marchings of fraternal organizations, of inaugurations, of returning heroes, even of baseball teams around the field. Remember how particular the bride is about every detail of her processions into and out of the church. Everyone must know his place and the affair must be rehearsed once or twice. Are all these things more important than the entering of the church by choir, acolytes and priest for the worship of Almighty God? This procession, too, may well be made stately and impressive by the use of cross, flags, lights and maybe even some swinging incense. Why should anyone stick at a religious procession?

(*b*) Let us consider vestments for a moment. They are not objected to in civil life; military dignitaries are magnificently clad and ornamented, the judges of the Supreme Court are robed in full and flowing silk, academic processions are marked by caps, gowns and hoods, many of them of the richest and most colorful silks and velvets obtainable, and women have gowns of varied materials and colors for various occasions. Can anyone argue that only in religious services must men be confined to a black cassock and a white cotton surplice? Ancient tradition from the Jewish Temple down through Christianity to Reformation days is all against this impoverishment of the services of the Church. Varied and beautiful materials and fine embroidery have always been employed and today the dignity and artistic beauty of our services is more and more frequently enhanced by a return to ancient ways. A special type of vestment — the chasuble — has always characterized the Eucharistic service; at its best, it is made of rich brocade of the color for the season, although white linen is proper. The chasuble is worn over a full and long linen garment known as the alb, and it is never at its most beautiful unless accompanied by an appareled amice. Colored silk stoles, of varying length and width, have become common.

(*c*) Turning now to the matter of postures and gestures, we are all agreed upon kneeling, standing and sitting at proper times as suitable and helpful — the body should have its part in worship. Bows, of the head or of the whole upper body, are used by many people. A bow toward the altar on arriving at one's pew is very common and very suitable. Said a naval officer, "I bow toward the altar as I do toward the quarter-deck — as a salute to the symbol of authority." With the same object children are taught to salute the flag. The sign of the cross is, perhaps, not so generally accepted; it is authorized by the Church in the baptismal service and most bishops and priests use it in giving the blessing. It seems a very suitable and helpful act to many of



our people as they finish the recitation of the creed, or at the final blessing.

(d) We all do our best with fine linen, silver, lighted candles and flowers to deck our dining table in honor of guests. Why do less for the Lord's table? All of these social observances are merely a means of indicating our respect and affection for those that we would honor. Said an old clergyman, "Our ceremonial observances are our good manners in church." It seems to me, then, that no one need shrink from any of the aesthetic devices that have developed for honoring and beautifying the Lord's Supper — beautiful colors, forms and movements for the eye, superb English and lovely music for the ear, and perhaps also religious perfume (incense) to purify and sweeten the air for the sense of smell. We may remark in passing that the use of incense is as old as the Hebrew temple service and it has never been turned to superstitious use. Anglican tradition approves it.

To tell the truth, it is not our ceremonial itself that some people object to but the fear that in it we are imitating and edging over toward Rome. This is an egregious mistake, since beautiful appointments and a dignified use of them are almost as old as the Church itself. Ancient paintings, brasses, carvings and illuminated manuscripts all bear ample evidence of this. We should not allow prejudice to blind us to the fact that there are good things that we have in common with Rome — and there are many such good things. No sane churchman would advocate giving up church-going, or Christmas and Easter, or surplices, or singing in church just because Rome observes them. Said a wise old professor, "I refuse to do anything just because Rome does it, and on the other hand, I refuse to give up any good thing just because Rome has it." There are indeed a few late Roman ceremonies to which we object — the use in service of the biretta (an Italian academic cap), the ornamenting of vestments and altar cloths with lace, the providing and using "holy water," and so on. The Anglican Society tells us all about these matters and it urges the avoidance of them. The English reformation, which freed our church from foreign domination, did not abolish ceremonial. It ruled that such things should remain as they had been (look up and read the Ornaments Rubric). The Episcopal Church stands unquestionably for ceremonies. Her Prayer Book provides many of them and common tradition was relied on for more. This tradition has often been disregarded in one quarter or another and the authorities have always been very tolerant of dissent in this direction, but such tolerance should not be taken as a lack of standards or a change in standards. The Ornaments Rubric has never been abrogated or changed. Neither has the American adhesion to it as expressed in our own Prayer Book preface.

We should not overlook in passing the great teaching value of right ceremonial. It is one of the simplest and surest ways of instilling into the young (and indeed into their elders as well) a sense of the significance and

reality of sacramental worship. Doing things has a power far beyond the mere hearing or thinking about them.

To sum up, High Church principles are quite separate and distinct from the ceremonial that is the outward expression of those principles. The highest estimate of the Church as a divine institution which has been sent to work the salvation of the world may, and often does, exist without any elaboration of outward trappings and acts. Indeed, the men of the Oxford Movement of 1833, who worked such a miracle in the reform of churchly ideals, were notably plain men in their conduct of church services. Outward expression of inner conviction is very probable, but it doesn't always follow. We may well remember this in estimating the churchmanship of ourselves and others. There are some people to whom symbols mean nothing; there are some people whose sense of artistic beauty and balance is not strong; there are some to whom simplicity and plainness are so native that these qualities run through all their activities and tastes. None of these people are appreciative of a highly developed religious ceremonial. We may dare to hope that most of them are true High Churchmen — or that they are on the way to becoming such. A wide knowledge of the Church and her history is sure to increase one's estimate of her value and importance. It has been said that a Low Churchman is an ill-informed Churchman; that the more he learns, the higher he gets.

So we may conclude that differences in ceremonial are not of radically great importance. People of different customs can notwithstanding worship together in happiness and comfort. What matters is one's understanding and estimate of the Church herself. We can all strive to know her history and principles better, to be fair and charitable toward those from whom we differ, to pray earnestly that we may all hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life.

## THE BENEDICTUS QUI VENIT

*(This article, reprinted from our News Sheet of September 1943, is timely. Besides the cogent reasons here shown, the General Convention of our Church has definitely forbidden the use of the Benedictus Qui Venit after the Sanctus; this is final for American Prayer Book Christians. — Ed.)*

The origin of the Benedictus qui venit is obscure. It appears originally to have been an anthem, or popular people's acclamation, addressed either to the emperor — who would have come from the nave to his throne in the sanctuary as it was sung — or to the bishop who would have gone from his chair behind the altar to the altar with his college of presbyters for the Eucharistic Prayer proper. In the late mediaeval period the thought seems to have been transferred to the coming of our Lord in his sacramental presence. It probably had something to do with the elevation — probably the elevation just before the communion of the people — and even there the anthem would be a greeting to the communicants. Just when it got attached to the Sanctus is impossible to say in the East and non-Roman West. It is an interpolation and not a very good one. The Sanctus and Benedictus are two distinct liturgical forms. The Sanctus was probably introduced in the Roman Mass from the African Church about the year 150. The Benedictus was introduced from the Gallican Church, not before the eleventh century. The two forms have no literary or liturgical connection.

The fact that it is an interpolation is shown by a study of the surviving great classic liturgies. The Roman Rite is an exception, but it is peculiar in that the opening phrases of its Eucharistic Prayer are intercessory instead of carrying out the thought of the introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer of praise, holiness, and thanksgiving. It is also true that the phrase, "Truly Holy, truly Blessed" or a variation is found in some of the Gallican liturgies. These liturgies have mostly perished or the Canon has been Romanized. This "truly Blessed" thought would be more prevalent if it were not an interpolation. Nearly all living liturgies which have come down to us from the early ages carry out the thought expressed in the Sanctus — "Truly holy art thou . . .," "With the blessed powers, . . . we also cry aloud and say: Holy art thou . . .," "Full is the heaven, full is the earth also of thy excellent glory . . ." The normal liturgy takes a cue from the Sanctus for the beginning of its Eucharistic Prayer. The normal expression is one of holiness or glory or thanksgiving.

Our Prayer Books since 1549 have generally omitted the Benedictus — though one or two of the latest revisions allow it as an anthem. Rather we have the perfect expression from a scientific liturgical standpoint — the



angelic hymn — then the Amen, the connective meaning Yea verily, of the cue word Glory.

It is worth more than passing notice that it is not sung in practice in the Roman Church to this day after the Sanctus when a priest celebrates, but the ancient connection with the elevation is kept up, and it is strictly forbidden by the Sacred Congregation of Rites to be sung before the elevation of the chalice. Another point worth noticing is this: when a bishop celebrates in the Roman Church it is sung after the Sanctus, and from a study of liturgical remnants, this would be a salutation to the bishop who at some remote period went from his throne to the altar after the Sanctus.

There is no reason that I can see for its interpolation into our liturgy. It destroys the connecting link between the Sanctus and the Prayer of Consecration. It introduces an incongruous thought. If it is sung at all, I suppose the best place would be just before the communion of the people as it is in the liturgy in the Apostolic Constitutions, which appear to be one of the original places. This has been done in some of the Anglican revisions. It has meaning there, but when it is interpolated between the Sanctus and the Prayer of Consecration, it has no liturgical justification and little meaning. It is psychologically bad in that it drags our thoughts down from the contemplation of heavenly things to an acclamation that may mean our Lord, but probably means our miserable selves.

The Benedictus qui venit in the various Prayer books of the Anglican Communion:

1549 — in, but in a slightly different form.

1552, 1558, 1662 — out.

English 1928 — permissive, but printed at end of service.

Scottish — permissive.

American — omitted.

South African — omitted.

Indian Liturgy — 1933 — just before communion.

"Holy things for holy persons" — Blessed is he that . . .

Ceylon 1939 — after the Pax after the Lord's Prayer.

Irish 1926 — omitted.

Canadian 1921 — omitted.

—F.F.E.B.

## “Look Unto the Rock Whence ye are Hewn —”

(From two articles in *The English Catholic of Autumn 1944 and of Winter and Spring 1945*).

The Anglo-Catholic movement of today claims to be the heir to the Oxford Movement and the custodian of the tractarian tradition within the Church of England. In view of the uncritical assimilation by modern Anglo-Catholicism of much present day Roman Catholic practice and teaching, we ask, how far is the claim justified? We publish extracts from two letters which deserve careful thought.

The first is dated, Christ Church, Oxford, June 13, 1882: —

“There is absolutely no authority in the early Church for reservation except for the sick, nor for the placing the Blessed Sacrament in a monstrance or censing, still less of the blessing the people with it. This last seems to me a most unjustifiable use of the Presence which He vouchsafes us. He gave it for one end. He has never authorized us to use His gracious Presence for another. No one has told us that He does bless us so.

It is this imitation of modern practices in the Roman Communion which repels people from us . . .

I agree with you entirely that our Blessed Lord instituted the Sacrament to give us His Body and Blood, and that we might plead the memorial of His sacrifice, that adoration is a natural result of that Presence, but not the object of the institution; and that reservation for the purpose of adoration is not according to primitive usage which we profess to follow.

(Signed) E. B. Pusey

The second letter is from the founder of the Cowley Fathers: —

Cowley St. John, June 18, 1882

“. . . I can in some degree understand people being carried away by a false idea of unity so as to join in Roman services . . . but really I cannot put myself in the position of a person wishing to keep the Month of Mary!

It implies a relation of mind towards the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ quite at variance with anything I can realize. I do not herein allude merely to the awful exaggerations of the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary, but to the representation of the Blessed Virgin Mary as possessing a permanent benedictory power by reason of her maternity in some channel of grace anterior to the sacramental system of the Church, which I may call the “neck” theory. It is this which is so preposterous.

“The neck is between the members and the head, whereas the special and incommunicable blessing of Mary is a blessing of nature preparatory to the dispensation of grace. The Head comes between us and her. I cannot say that I even like persons reciting the Angelus, because one sees what it

has grown to; but that is a very different thing from the mouth of Mary, or, as the phrase goes, "being under the mantle of Mary."

People do not realize the Personal Sovereign care which our Lord Jesus Christ, the god-man, exercises over His Church or the Personal Presence of the Holy Ghost, by whose ministration he exercises it.

The Pope - Mary - the Reserved Sacrament - are in various ways the substitute for this . . . .

I am sure that, however natural it may be to desire to have the reserved sacrament, the desire for it does, and must, stand in the way of profiting by the presence of the Comforter. Christ is no nearer to us because of that Sacramental Presence. He cannot be nearer, for we are one with Him and He with us, and the Throne of God is nearer to us than any monstinance can make it — and His Presence in the Sacrament is supra local; and therefore Christ does not come nearer to us by that manifestation in space. He is present as our Food, and as our Oblation, but His Personal action is that of a Priest towards God, and it is by His Holy Spirit that He acts towards us. Any action of the Second Person which was not through the Third would be inconsistent with His glorification, and therefore of no value to us. The two persons cannot be collateral agents. This would be inconsistent with their relation in the Eternal Trinity.

I am afraid people do not at all realize the coequal consubstantial personal godhead of the Holy Ghost. If they did they would not wish to bring Christ down from above. It is very much like the Israelites thinking that they could take the ark of God into the battlefield. They removed it from the place where it would have been their strength if they were faithful to it.

—*R. M. Benson*



## STATEMENT

This statement was published several years ago by the English Branch of the Society. It is well worthy of study — (*Ed.*).

In furthering its aims the Anglican Society maintains: —

1. That the Catholic Religion is that Faith once delivered to the saints, which, enshrined in Holy Scripture, found expression in the life and worship of the primitive and undivided Church.

2. That the Catholic Tradition of the ancient and undivided Church is an indispensable guide to the true interpretation of Holy Scripture. . .

3. That the promise of the Spirit, Who should lead us into all truth, is not however confined to past ages, and therefore modern knowledge and enquiry into the grounds of faith are to be welcomed.

4. That loyal English Catholics have grave cause to remonstrate with the many who tolerate and advocate deviations from the Catholic Religion, justifying those deviations by an appeal to the current teaching and practice of the Church of Rome.

5. That the Book of Common Prayer (whether of 1662 or 1928) is fully consistent with Catholic Faith and Order, and that members of the Church of England can display their Catholic principles only by a strict loyalty to that book.

6. That loyalty and order within the Church of England constitute a necessary preliminary to any fruitful scheme for the reunion of Christendom.

7. That the introduction of alien forms and ceremonies into the Church of England, whatever their place of origin, by implicitly denying the authority of the Church of England to order its own rites and ceremonies, and by causing distress and confusion in the minds of the faithful laity, hinders rather than helps the cause of true unity.

8. That the practice of the English Use does not imply a merely antiquarian outlook or insularity of temper, but an appreciation of our own traditions as a good and legitimate expression of the common Catholic Faith.

The Anglican Society invites all who are in sympathy with these aims and principles and are in communion with the See of Canterbury, to become members of the Society. Applications for membership should be addressed to the General Secretary.

## BOOKS FOR EVERY MAN'S LIBRARY

*Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* by Richard Hooker. (The classic work — valuable to many readers is Hooker's Polity [in modern English] by John S. Marshall).

*The Christian Faith* by C. B. Moss. (Perhaps the best general work on Dogmatics).

*The Parson's Handbook* (ninth and previous editions) by Percy Dearmer. (Still the best and most complete work on Ceremonial).

All the Alcuin Club publications.

*Everyman's History of the Church*

*Everyman's History of the Prayer Book* by Percy Dearmer. (Two Popular works, admirable).

All the books put out by Bishop Carey (President of the English Anglican Society) and by Bishop Wand (the present Bishop of London) are good.

*History of the Church of England* by Wakeman.

To these may well be added books suggested by the Examining Chaplains of Western Massachusetts for use in preparing *Diocesan Lay Readers*: —

*Guide For Lay Readers* (Morehouse-Gorham).

*Instructions in the Life of Prayer* by Whiston (10 cents).

*Faith and Practice* by Wilson.

*The Anglican Church and Henry VIII* by Hughson (O.H.C.).

*Story of the Bible* by Bowie (\$2.95).

*Religion of the Prayer Book* by Pell and Dawley.

*A Short History of the Christian Church* by C. P. S. Clark.

*The Holy Scriptures* (National Council, \$1.50).

*The American Prayer Book* by Suter & Cleaveland.

## BOOK NOTICES

*The Holy Scriptures* by the Rev. Dr. Dentan of the Berkeley Divinity School is a helpful book, the first of the series on "The Church's Teaching" issued by the National Council. Excellent indeed is the following from this book (p. 160):—

To become a Christian has never meant merely to adopt a new set of beliefs or come to accept a new standard of conduct. It has always involved at least two things: first, a willingness, in faith and trust, to accept Christ as Lord, and second to become a member of His Church. In New Testament times those who accepted Christ as Lord were convinced that in doing so they had undergone an experience equivalent to passing from death into life. The Christian believed that he had come to share in the very nature of Christ. He had become united to Him in a kind of mystical union so intense that he could say with St. Paul, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.

Other volumes will follow on "Church History," "The Worship of the Church," "The Church's Faith," "Christian Living," and "The Church at Work." If these volumes maintain the high standard achieved by Dr. Dentan's book, they will be valuable indeed.

\* \* \* \* \*

An article in last October's *Anglican Theological Review* by the Rev. Dr. Louis A. Haselmayer, Jr., is worthy of careful reading. Dr. Haselmayer shows how necessary it is, in all plans for Christian unity, to make certain that the church's teaching on Priesthood be adequately considered and not watered down or neglected.

\* \* \* \* \*

The many readers of *The Shape of the Liturgy* by Dom Gregory Dix, a monumental work of real scholarship, should not miss the excellent and very thoughtful criticisms of his treatment of Archbishop Cranmer. The Rev. G. B. Timms, General Secretary of our parent English branch, has written *Dixit Cranmer*, a pamphlet published by the Alcuin Club and the Rev. Dr. Cyril C. Richardson has written *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist* published by the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. Dr. Richardson shows that Dom Gregory has not really understood what Zwingli taught. Possibly also many of us Anglicans do not have an adequate idea of his teaching!

*The Oxford American Psalter* by Ray F. Brown of the General Seminary is a very fine work. The psalter and canticles are printed and set to Anglican chants. All choirmasters should possess this book. Dr. Brown is a pupil of the late Sir Sydney Nicholson, Director of the Royal School of Church Music and Editor of the *Parish Psalter*. His is a great name in English Church music. The Essays in Dr. Brown's book are excellent.



## NOTES

Very encouraging it was to have Bishop Jenkins write that the Society had been of real use in promoting the observance throughout the Church of the Prayer Book Anniversary. Would that all Churchmen in 1950 might show the results of Prayer Book study by sincere belief in and practice of Prayer Book Religion!

\* \* \* \* \*

The Secretary was able to procure (gratis) 250 copies of Bishop Oldham's fine address before the late General Convention commemorating 1549. He mailed these to the bishops and priests of the Society, except to those of the diocese of Albany, who had already received copies. The Secretary has a few copies left which he will be glad to send to any who desire them.

\* \* \* \* \*

The next issue of *The Anglican* will be published by *The Witness*, according to special arrangements with the Society. Bishop Oldham's address will be reprinted. There will be an account with pictures of the great service in St. Paul's Cathedral, Buffalo, on June 9, 1949. Other articles, in fact all the articles in the issue, concern the Society.

\* \* \* \* \*

The *English Catholic*, the excellent quarterly issued by the English Branch, may be had by sending to the Secretary one dollar for a year's subscription. The Society used to send the quarterly gratis to each member, but mounting costs prohibited this. We now have 22 subscribers.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Society has now over 400 members. It would be fine to increase these to 1,000, in accordance with the suggestion by our President a year or so ago. Could each member secure *one* new member? Everybody try!

\* \* \* \* \*

St. Stephen's, Pittsfield, Mass., has recently remodeled its chapel altar with beautiful dossal and complete frontals in the traditional fashion. It will shortly arrange the high altar similarly.

\* \* \* \* \*

St. Andrew's, Blackinton, Mass., has rearranged its altar in the traditional fashion, in memory of the late Dr. J. Franklin Carter, founder of the Mission; a large picture of the Sistine Madonna, once the property of the late Bishop Vinton, the first Bishop of the Diocese (Western Massachusetts) has been hung above the dossal in his memory.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Editor will gladly welcome a "Question Box" if any of our readers desire to have it.



